

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ex rel. §
STEPHEN DEAN, §
§
Plaintiffs, § Civ. No. 4:14-CV-203
§
v. § JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
§
PARAMEDICS PLUS, L.L.C., et al., §
§
Defendants. §

ETMC DEFENDANTS' REPLY TO UNITED STATES' RESPONSE TO ETMC
DEFENDANTS' EMERGENCY MOTION TO QUASH

To the Honorable Court:

Defendants Paramedics Plus, LLC (öParamedics Plusö), East Texas Medical Center Regional Healthcare System (öETMC Systemö), East Texas Medical Center Regional Health Services, Inc. (together with ETMC System, öETMCö) (collectively the öETMC Defendantsö) file this Reply to United Statesö Response to ETMC Defendantsö Emergency Motion to Quash and would respectfully show:

In its reply, the government misstates that the primary issue that the ETMC Defendants have with the Governmentö Motion is that they failed to meet and confer in accordance with the local rules.¹ This is not the case. While the ETMC Defendants do contend that the United States failed to meet and confer in accordance with the local rules, the ETMC Defendants chief complaint with the governmentö motion is that they did not and cannot show the necessary

¹ Apparently the government believes it is exempt from the local rules meet-and-confer requirements because it is the government, and because motions for garnishment are exempt from the local rules meet-and-confer requirements. However, the United States did not file a motion for garnishment, a post-judgment remedy, but instead filed a pre-judgment motion for sequestration, an extraordinary remedy, which is not listed on the motions exempt from the local rules meet-and-confer requirement. Nor does the United States contend Motions for Sequestration are listed. Their argument, then, is that such motions öshould beö exempt from the local rules meet-and-confer requirements. But they are not.

proof in order to be entitled to an order for sequestration. The ETMC Defendants expect to be able to show that the United States is not entitled to such relief upon hearing of the Court. The ETMC Defendants were unable to fully brief this issue because the government&s manufactured öemergencyö created a *real* emergency for the ETMC Defendants in that if such order is not dissolved today, the planned sale will not go forward, and ETMC will default on its bonds, putting healthcare in East Texas at jeopardy. For such reason, the ETMC Defendants request a hearing on this matter as soon as possible today.

Date: February 27, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Otis Carroll
Otis W. Carroll, Jr.
State Bar No. 03895700
Collin M. Maloney
State Bar No. 00794219
Mandy Nelson
State Bar No. 24055270
IRELAND, CARROLL & KELLEY, P.C.
6101 S. Broadway Ste. 500
Tyler, TX 75703
(903) 561.1600
otiscarroll@icklaw.com
cmaloney@icklaw.com
mnelson@icklaw.com

T. John Ward
State Bar No. 20848000
WARD, SMITH, & Hill PLLC
1507 Bill Owens Parkway
Longview, TX 75604
(903) 757.6400
tjw@wsfirm.com

Michael C. Coker
ADAMS & COKER, P.C.
State Bar. No. 04527100
4540 Kinsey Drive

Tyler, TX 75703
(903) 581.1196
mikecoker@adams-coker.com

Scott E. Stevens
State Bar No. 00792024
David P. Henry
State Bar No. 24027015
STEVENS | HENRY
P.O. Box 3427
Longview, Texas 75606
Telephone: (903) 7536760
Fax: (903) 753-6761
scott@stevenshenry.com
david@stevenshenry.com

Kyle J. Nelson
State Bar No. 24056031
NELSON LAW FIRM
5380 Old Bullard Rd., Ste 600-187
Tyler, Texas 75703
(903) 561-8449
kyle@knelsonlaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

By my signature below, I do hereby certify that on February 27, 2018, a true and correct copy of the foregoing documents was filed using the Court's electronic filing system, which will provide notice to all parties of record, specifically:

James Gillingham
United States Attorney's Office
Tyler Office
110 North College, Ste. 700
Tyler, Texas 75702

By: */s/ Otis W. Carroll*
Otis W. Carroll